```
680
              THE COURT: The defendant's name was Jihaad in that
1
 2
    case?
 3
              MR. DRATEL: Abu-Jihaad. He was a Navy --
 4
              THE COURT: Okay. See you in five minutes.
 5
               (Recess taken.)
               (The following occurred in the absence of jury.)
 6
7
              THE COURT: Are you all set?
8
              MR. DRATEL: Your Honor, we just have one -- I
9
    apologize.
10
              THE COURT:
                          That's okay.
              MR. DRATEL: I apologize for bearing the lead on
11
12
    this.
13
              There are two expert reports from Mr. Kohlmann, one
14
    that we received I think in March and one that we just
15
    received about a week and a half ago. We are objecting to the
16
    second one and any opinions based on it simply because of
17
    timeliness. We would have had an opportunity to get our own
18
    witness, particularly with respect to the coastline video and
19
    his analysis of it in the context of martyrdom videos and we
20
    think that we would have been able to -- with the proper
21
    amount of time, have been able to get an expert to come in and
22
    establish obviously the contrary.
23
              That's our objection to the opinion with respect to
24
    the -- the witness' analysis of the coastline video.
25
                          Okay. Not having seen either report, I
              THE COURT:
```

am not sure what the difference is. I take it, your objection is on procedural grounds because you got the second report too late. You want to preclude any testimony that is not reflected in the first report.

MR. DRATEL: Correct, Your Honor.

MR. DuCHARME: Your Honor, our witness had a medical condition. There really wasn't much we could do about it.

The new piece of information essentially that's contained in the later report is that the witness was asked to look at the coastline video, what we have argued is a martyrdom video, and to analyze it in the context of other jihadist type material. We would expect him to say if asked is that that video has certain elements in common with other videos that he's reviewed that were essentially last will videos by people who were martyrs.

He is not going to conclusively say it is or isn't a martyrdom video. He will say, for example, a reference to jannah is a reference to paradise which I frequently have seen in martyrdom videos. A reference to a couple of the phrases and terms are the same as terms that he's seen in martyrdom videos. I think he is going to opine that it bears resemblance to martyrdom videos that suggests to him it was likely modeled on one. Although he will concede there are other explanations for it.

THE COURT: I am not sure I need to address the

```
682
1
    merits of your procedural claim. That's really not the sort
 2
    of testimony I'd permit anyway.
 3
              MR. DuCHARME: Okay. Then we won't offer.
 4
              MR. DRATEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right. Would you bring the jury in,
 5
 6
    please?
7
              We will go 9:30 to 1:00 o'clock tomorrow. I think
8
    we are on a pretty good pace here. We are even a little ahead
9
    of schedule.
10
              Does that sound right to you?
11
              MR. DuCHARME: Yes.
12
              We may be able to rest tomorrow.
13
              THE COURT:
                          Is the defense case going to last more
14
    than a day or two?
              MR. STERN: Not more than a day; not two.
15
              THE COURT: All right. So you will be ready to sum
16
17
    up next week. We are missing Monday, obviously.
18
    sounds like we could get to summations as early as Wednesday.
19
              MR. STERN: I think it's possible, yes.
20
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
21
              (Jury present.)
22
              THE COURT: Sorry to keep you waiting. We have been
23
    working.
24
              Have a seat, everyone, please.
25
              We are ready to resume.
```

712 important that you base your verdict solely on the evidence in 1 2 the case and not be tainted by information from outside the 3 courtroom. 4 Okay. So we'll see you tomorrow. Have a nice Safe home. Don't discuss the case. 5 evening. All rise. 6 7 (Jury excused.) 8 THE COURT: Is there some dispute that you had in 9 mind. 10 MR. DRATEL: May I come up? 11 THE COURT: Yes. 12 MR. DRATEL: My problem is twofold. One is the 13 concept -- global jihadist movement is a concept and it's 14 really his concept. It's not a concept that's recognized in 15 There's no incorporation. It's not even like an the world. 16 organized crime family or an association in fact or anything like that. It's just sort of an intellectual creation. 17 18 And I'm concerned that discussion in that context or 19 giving it labels like that will be a substitute for the jury 20 for what's really required in this case, which is a 956(a) 21 conspiracy, not some worldwide movement that people who have 22 never met each other, from all different countries, that 23 people say because they believe in the same thing that it's a 24 movement. That's not a substitute for a 956(a) conspiracy 25 which the government has to prove.

And I'm concerned about that just from historical cases and the way he's testified in other cases. So I don't want it to get into that notion that somehow that exists as a coherent entity and that he's part of it and that that's going to be enough for them, not that he's going to say that, but that it's going to act that way by the time we're done.

THE COURT: Well, your remarks incorporate a number of different areas. One is his expert testimony about a subject that might -- that I think is probably beyond the ken -- as the case law phrase it -- of the average juror.

A second one is the extent to which this defendant might have been part of that. I'll be ultrasensitive to any testimony that gets close to that subject.

I am not sure exactly what your objection is precisely. The testimony about the global jihadist movement I don't find particularly objectionable. This might be a good time for us to discuss this, because we have not yet really. I think the real rub in testimony of this sort is when an expert -- you don't have to agree with this and if you disagree with it you'll tell me -- is when an expert strays from informing the jury about a phenomenon about which he's got specialized training, indisputably, specialized training and knowledge and expertise, strays from testifying about that thing, here, the global jihadist movement.

Then, on the other hand, testimony about the

evidence in the case and I am acutely sensitive to anything that looks like it might be perceived by a lay jury as expert testimony that the defendant is guilty.

So you may sensitize me to this -- I'm not concerned about the testimony he's given thus far. I don't know how far you intend to go, Mr. DuCharme, with the particular evidence in this case.

MR. DuCHARME: I would like to front it for you. I have turned over to Mr. Dratel my direct script. There shouldn't be any surprises here. What we intend to elicit from Mr. Kohlmann is a number of statements. The first is essentially just the existence in a very, very simple straightforward way that Al Qaeda exists, what the word Al Qaeda means, how it operates. The same for Al-Shabaab. We'll offer through him the Al-Shabaab designation on the SDTG list. The same for the fact that there are these Chechnyan groups. That's going to be limited testimony. The general framework. Jihadists from three different parts of the world, Somalia, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Chechnya.

Then we expect to ask Mr. Kohlmann about the results of what he was asked to do in this case, which was we provided him with a copy of the defendant's hard drive and we asked him to go through it and look for things that were significant to him in the context of jihad or assimilating into a jihadist group and what he did is he identified for us several videos

which he tells us are useful for assimilating into this closed and specialized culture.

And what he'll say is, for example, some of the Osama bin Laden videos are sort of classics and that a person who is assimilating to a jihadist group is expected to fellow them, expected to be able to quote them and discuss them amongst their peers.

And then he's going to point to specific documents that he found on the hard drive, Word documents which incorporate direct quotations from some of those classic videos.

We've got those on the board. Judge I can flip around and show you. One of them for a Nasheed, a jihadist song. What Mr. Kohlmann found is a Word document that shows the lyrics of this jihadist song in Arabic, spelled phonetically, and in English. We will later argue to the jury that what he's doing is he's learning these Nasheeds. We're going to argue -- we're not going to ask Mr. Kohlmann to testify to this -- we're going to argue that the reason he's learning the Nasheeds because it's going help him assimilate into a jihadi group or a foreign terrorist organization when he gets there.

He's also going to show the jury another document that he found, which is in evidence as Government's Exhibit 810, and that is a document where he's listed Osama bin Laden

quotes from videos that he has saved on his hard drive. We're going to put those in through him and we expect to later argue, again, its probative of his state of mind. He's not only casually surfing these things. He's reading them. He's studying them and he's adopting them and we're going to ask Mr. Kohlmann are these things useful to someone who is trying to assimilate into a jihadist group or a foreign terrorist organization.

We expect that he will say, yes, that learning these things and adopting these things helps a Westerner come to Somalia or Afghanistan or Chechnya and essentially sit down around the campfire and be accepted into group because he can sing the songs and quote the movies and issue the quotations.

That's where we're going.

THE COURT: What is it about that that requires expertise though? I would think the jury would know this stuff would facilitate the assimilation of the defendant into a jihadist group.

MR. DuCHARME: I think it's just the context. For example, the statement of the Humma video. There's been testimony already elicited that there are thousands of videos on YouTube and anybody can stumble across them. The significance here is what the defendant has done is he has picked the ones that are most or some of most recognized among the groups that we allege he is trying to get into. He has

```
717
    picked the ones that will be most recognizable to Al Qaeda.
1
 2
    Nasheed, the Osama bin Laden quotes and certain Somalia
3
    material that will allow him to assimilate into Al-Shabaab and
 4
    we're going to argue that's probative of his intent do those
             He put into effort into that.
5
    things.
              What Mr. Kohlmann will say, these some of the ones
6
7
    that will be important. These aren't the silly ones that are
8
    made by home-grown jihadists that they just post themselves on
9
    YouTube.
              These are the classic examples, As Sahab, that this
10
    is part --
11
              THE COURT: Excuse me one second.
12
              MR. DuCHARME:
                             Sure.
13
               (Continued on next page.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

718 1 THE COURT: Excuse me one second. 2 (Pause.) 3 Juror number 12, our pregnant juror, is very sick, 4 including vomiting, back in the jury room. Has she requested that she be excused? Or this is 5 just happening back there? 6 THE CLERK: 7 She is insinuating. She kept saying you 8 knew she was pregnant and she is not feeling well. The whole 9 day she has been in and out of the restroom whenever she could. 10 11 THE COURT: If you could please ask her whether she 12 means she would like to be excused from jury service. 13 THE CLERK: Okay. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. DuCHARME: Aside from that, judge, I will just 16 define certain Arabic terms. 17 I don't intend to go back and witness THE COURT: 18 for myself what Ilene described for me. I intend to excuse 19 this woman. 20 Does anybody object? 21 MR. DuCHARME: I can't imagine we do. 22 No objection from the government. 23 MR. DRATEL: No. 24 THE COURT: All right. 25 THE CLERK: She says yes, she can't sit in here

719 1 anymore. 2 THE COURT: All right. I will try to take that in 3 the best possible light. Tell her her application --4 MR. DRATEL: It might have been the fire drill. THE COURT: Tell her her application is granted. 5 6 Good luck with the rest of her life, with her pregnancy, with 7 everything. Just tell her she is excused. 8 THE CLERK: Yes. 9 THE COURT: All right. Do you want to be heard? 10 MR. DRATEL: Your Honor, what Your Honor said was 11 very much what Judge Carr said in the Amawi case. The context 12 of what -- what kind of expertise is necessary. Many of these 13 videos and other -- the documentary stuff speaks for 14 themselves. They don't require the additional context of what 15 they are used for necessarily. 16 This witness has testified a lot and he has 17 testified in many different forums and I am also concerned 18 about the fact that -- I appreciate what the government has 19 done in terms of trying to keep him narrow because we have talked about this. They have adjusted some of the conclusions 20 21 that he wrote in his report and made them much more palatable. 22

But at the same time he's gone a lot further in a lot of cases. So he needs a short leash in that regard and I know the government is trying but that's also something that we are very concerned about in terms of when he goes beyond

23

24

25

that.

Just to get back to the global jihadist movement, my problem is there is no definition of that other than the one that he has that's out there. There is no -- you can't find a definition that is agreed upon in the world. I am just concerned that when the jury hears global jihadist movement and if he uses it as a synonym for people who join terrorist organizations or is it people who sympathize with jihad or is it people who believe in that or people who investigate it or -- I don't mean investigate it, counterterrorism, but investigate it on their own for the question of whether they want to do something about it.

It's too amorphous a -- it's too amorphous a term I think to include every one and anyone who might be in -- wherever the penumbra is on that. I am just concerned that's going to include Mr. Kaziu in the jury's eyes when in fact that's not what this case is about.

THE COURT: We will play it as it goes. I will think about it some more tonight. There is one thought that I have that I will share with you. That is, I do think -- this issue about these are generally accessible materials is already part of the case. I don't think -- to the extent that there is expert testimony that these are the main ones for these organizations, I think that's fair ground for the government.

The thought I want to share with you, Mr. DuCharme, is I want that separated as much as possible from the discrete facts of this case and by that I mean this is just so that the order of presentation -- I don't want to create the impression before the jury -- because juries get confused by experts -- I don't want to create the impression that is risked when an expert takes the laptop that's taken from the defendant and flips through it before the jury and says, oh, here is a main text for Al Shabaab or here is the main ones that someone assimilating himself into Al Qaeda really needs to know. The way that gets presented matters, in my judgment.

So what I would like you to do is structure his testimony as best you can to have him testify about those main texts, whatever they are, in a manner that is distant from the defendant as best as possible. I am not articulating this very well. I believe you understand my point.

MR. DuCHARME: I do understand.

THE COURT: To finish the thought, later on if you want to argue that here is what's on his computer, you have heard that although there is lots of generally available stuff, this is the main stuff. You make that argument.

But to the extent it comes from him in the manner in which the testimony is presented, I think it matters. I want you to avoid that.

MR. DuCHARME: Okay. Here is the challenge for us,

Your Honor. The materials that we are going to show through Evan Kohlmann -- he's the one who found them on the hard drive. So up to this point, there has been no testimony that these were the items found on the defendant's laptop. I suppose -- that sounds like the sensitivity, that sounds like what you want to us avoid.

I suppose what we can do is, as long as there is not

going to be any objection from the defense, is that after he testifies, through the case agent, our next witness, we can just put them in front of her and say where did these come from. She will say those came from the defendant's laptop.

THE COURT: There won't be a problem with that.

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: Someone might argue that this elevates form over substance but I don't think so, not the way jurors tend to hang on experts. I would like you to do it that way.

MR. DuCHARME: Okay.

THE COURT: I will think about it some more. If I have further thoughts, other than I am sensitive to your concerns and I will rule on objections as we go, I will share them with you before we start tomorrow.

MR. DRATEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. DuCHARME: I understand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right?

MR. DRATEL: Great.